

Alexis Mager Lakusta, pro se  
1259 El Camino Real #245  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
(650) 566-9971

FILED  
DEC -5 PM 4:10  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

Alexis Mager Lakusta,	)	C-07-03085 SBA
Appellant	)	Bankruptcy Court No. 02-31521
v.	)	
Mark Evans, et al.,	)	<b>APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION</b>
Appellees	)	<b>OF TIME TO FILE OPENING</b>
	)	<b>BRIEF</b>

Appellant Alexis Lakusta hereby requests that the date for his opening brief in the above-cited case be extended to December 26, 2007. The Court issued an order on November 6, 2007 ordering that his opening brief be served and filed no later than December 5, 2007. The order further states that the case "will be dismissed" if appellant fails to file a brief by that date "for failure to prosecute".

Judge Armstrong's order notwithstanding, Mr. Lakusta, a pro se litigant who is attempting to assert his inalienable right to protect his property, as guaranteed by Article 1, Section 1 of the California Constitution, and who is, not incidentally, also attempting to protect the significant financial

1 interests of his legitimate creditors (please see **exhibit A** of the accompany-  
2 ing Declaration), respectfully states his belief that his request for an  
3 extension of time to file and serve his opening brief in this appeal is not  
4 unreasonable in light of the concurrent filing deadlines in immediately  
5 related cases.

6 This appeal is one of several appeals currently being prosecuted by Mr.  
7 Lakusta in the California Court of Appeal (one appeal), in the United States  
8 Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (two appeals), and in this court (two  
9 appeals) concerning the same matter of an equity theft scheme and a fraud  
10 on the court by Defendants Evans, et al. and by Defendant Evans' attorneys  
11 (not limited to Pahl and McCay and specifically to Mr. Stephen Pahl and Ms.  
12 Catherine Schlomann Robertson of that firm). The fraud on the court was  
13 intended to conceal a bankruptcy fraud scheme from the scrutiny of the  
14 court (please see **exhibit B**, an excerpt from one of the informal opening  
15 briefs Mr. Lakusta is writing for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, for an  
16 summary overview of the nature of the case and a statement of the legal  
17 issues involved). The appeals are all the direct outgrowth of the same  
18 matter for which Mr. Lakusta originally sought the assistance of the United  
19 States Bankruptcy Court upon the advice of attorney Robert R. Patterson  
20 (see **exhibit C** of the supporting Declaration), and it would be a complete  
21 fiction to separate out any one of the appeal cases referred to above,  
22 including this one, from the other appeals and not consider the prosecution  
23 of the case in its entirety.

24 Mr. Lakusta was denied an opportunity to discuss with this court his  
25 concurrent filing obligations in other courts in the prosecution of the overall

1 case when the case management conference for this case, which had been  
2 scheduled for October <sup>15</sup>~~25~~, 2007 and for which Mr. Lakusta appeared in the  
3 courtroom of Judge Armstrong on the appointed day and at the appointed  
4 hour, was taken off the calendar without notice of any kind to Mr. Lakusta  
5 or to any creditors of the Lakusta bankruptcy estate (please see **exhibit D**).

6 For these reasons Mr. Lakusta respectfully requests that the court  
7 extend the filing deadline to December 26, 2007. A declaration and a  
8 proposed order accompany this application.

9 I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United  
10 States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.  
11

12 Dated: December 5, 2007

Alexis Mager Lakusta  
Alexis Mager Lakusta,  
Appellant, pro se